

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/080,222	02/21/2002	Yiding Cao		9754	
75	90 05/17/2004		EXAM	INER	
Yiding Cao 16302 SW 68 Terrace			CREPEAU, JONATHAN		
Miami, FL 33			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
,			1746	1746	

DATE MAILED: 05/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				T.		
Office Action Summary		Application No.	Applicant(s)	_		
		10/080,222	CAO ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Jonathan S. Crepeau	1746			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
THE - External control	MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  Insions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.12  In SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  In period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply of period for reply is specified above, the maximum statuory period to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)[\inf	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 Fe	ebruary 2002.				
•		action is non-final.				
3)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		secution as to the merits is			
,—	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposit	ion of Claims					
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.				
Applicat	ion Papers					
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomplicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine	epted or b) objected to by the Education of the Education of by the Education of the Educat	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority (	under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign  All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents  2. Certified copies of the priority documents  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents  application from the International Bureau  See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage			
2) Notic 3) Inform Pape	t(s) se of References Cited (PTO-892) se of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:				

Application/Control Number: 10/080,222

Art Unit: 1746

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1, 2, 4-11, and 13-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muthuswamy et al (U.S. Patent 6,060,188) in view of Corey et al (U.S. Patent 6,632,553).

Regarding claims 1 and 9, Muthuswamy et al. teach a tubular fuel cell comprising a circular membrane electrode assembly comprising an anode catalyst (26), cathode catalyst (24) and solid polymer electrolyte (25) (see Fig. 1). An air flow duct (22) is on the cathode side, and an annular fuel reservoir (28) is on the anode side (see Fig. 1). The fuel may comprise liquid methanol (see col. 4, line 20). Regarding claims 4, 6, 13, and 15, both flow chambers may contain a porous structure (see Fig. 4). Regarding claims 5, 7, 14, and 16, a thin layer of electrically conductive electrode diffusion material (e.g., metal fiber) (23, 27) is coated on the porous material (see col. 3, line 26). Regarding claim 9, a plurality of tubular fuel cells may be contained in the same housing (see Figure 6). Regarding claims 1 and 9, terminals are appropriately connected to the cell(s) (see col. 4, line 24).

Application/Control Number: 10/080,222

Art Unit: 1746

Muthuswamy et al. do not expressly teach a carbon dioxide relief valve as recited in claims 1, 8, 9, and 17, that the system comprises an external fuel tank and valve (claims 2 and 11), or that the terminals are connected in series (claim 10).

However, the artisan would be motivated to connect the terminals of the plurality of fuel cells of Muthuswamy together in series. Such an arrangement would serve to increase the voltage of the unit and is therefore considered to be obvious to a skilled artisan.

Further, Corey et al. is directed to a direct methanol fuel cell system. The system comprises an external fuel tank (39), a supply valve (56), and a carbon dioxide exhaust valve (36) (see Figure 3).

Therefore, the invention as a whole would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made because the artisan would be motivated to incorporate the elements of Corey et al. into the system of Muthuswamy. In column 4, line 25, Muthuswamy teaches that "[t]ypically, the oxidant and fuel are introduced into one end of the cylinder and recovered or vented at the other end. However, additional inlets and outlets can be provided along the length of the cylinder in appropriate manifolding if desired, and still be considered to fall with the scope and spirit of our invention." Furthermore, in column 2, line 61, Corey et al. teach the following:

According, the suitability of DMFC power systems for powering portable devices and consumer electronics is dependent upon the development of systems and methods for eliminating and/or recirculating the effluent products produced during operation of the fuel cell. In addition, in order for DMFC power systems to be used effectively, they must be self-regulating and passively generate electrical power under benign operating conditions, such as ambient air temperature and pressure.

Application/Control Number: 10/080,222

Art Unit: 1746

As the system of Corey et al. is self-regulating, the artisan would be motivated to incorporate the features of the system into the fuel cell of Muthuswamy et al. As such, the recitations of a carbon dioxide relief valve, an external fuel tank, and a supply valve would be rendered obvious to a skilled artisan.

3. Claim 3 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muthuswamy et al. in view of Corey et al. as applied to claims 1, 2, 4-11, and 13-17 above, and further in view of McNicol et al (*J. Power Sources*, 1999).

Muthuswamy et al. do not expressly teach that the system comprises a control unit that applies a continuous instantaneous pulsed load cycle to the fuel cell, as recited in claims 3 and 12.

On page 24, second column, McNicol et al. teach that a continuous instantaneous pulsed load cycle is applied to a direct methanol fuel cell.

Therefore, the invention as a whole would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made because the artisan would be motivated to apply the load cycle of McNicol et al. to the fuel cell of Muthuswamy et al. On page 24, second column, McNicol et al. teach that "switching the current off for short periods of time results in a return of the catalytic activity to its pseudo steady-state level. This fortunate observation encouraged Shell to conduct life test using various programmed on/off sequences; very little loss in activity

Art Unit: 1746

was observed over thousands of hours." As such, the artisan would be motivated to apply the load cycle of McNicol et al. to the fuel cell of Muthuswamy et al.

## Conclusion

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jonathan Crepeau whose telephone number is (571) 272-1299. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Friday from 9:30 AM - 6:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Randy Gulakowski, can be reached at (571) 272-1302. The phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 272-1700. Documents may be faxed to the central fax server at (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jonathan Crepeau Patent Examiner Art Unit 1746 May 13, 2004